DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 606 EA 012 449

AUTHOR Gaarder, A. Bruce
TITLE Cultural Pluralism and Other Major Issues in American Education. Part I. Decentralized Project No. 4 (Special Activity). International Management Training for Educational Change (IMTEC).
INSTITUTION International Management Training for Educational Change, Oslo (Norway).
PUB DATE 31 Aug 76
NOTE 48p.: Prepared for the IMTEC/OECD United States Bicentennial Seminar: Managing Change in Urban Education (Boston, MA, October 10-29, 1976). Some pages may not reproduce clearly due to light print of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM IMTEC, P.O. Box 79 Blindern, Oslo 3, Norway ($2.00 plus mailing costs).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action: Biculturalism: *Bilingual Education: Bilingualism: *Compensatory Education: Cultural Awareness: Cultural Background: *Cultural Pluralism: Educationally Disadvantaged: Educational Objectives: Elementary Secondary Education: *Equal Education: Minority Groups: *Multicultural Education: Postsecondary Education: *School Desegregation: Social History: Social Integration: Social Status: Sociocultural Patterns: Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

Most of the dilemmas, contradictions, and inconsistencies that beset the nation's schools relate either directly or indirectly to the ambiguous, overworked twin concepts of cultural pluralism and the great American melting pot. Examination of the ethnic history of the United States reveals that those minorities urging cultural pluralism were effectively excluded from the benefits of American society while less visible minorities were being assimilated. These excluded minorities are now trying a different route to equity, without realizing that the methods they are using have historically resulted in the dissolution of the cultural groups using them. The traditional American concern for equality that underlies efforts at cultural pluralism also underlies many other no less complex movements in education: those for equal opportunity, compensatory education, desegregation, bilingual and bicultural education, and affirmative action. The philosophical roots and likely outcomes of these movements are explored in this document. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED198606

IMTEC/US Seminar/8
Oslo, 31st August, 1976

DECENTRALISED PROJECT No. 4 (SPECIAL ACTIVITY)

INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT TRAINING

FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

(IMTEC)

IMTEC/OECD UNITED STATES BICENTENNIAL SEMINAR

MANAGING CHANGE IN URBAN EDUCATION

CULTURAL PLURALISM AND OTHER MAJOR ISSUES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Part I

1. The attached is Part I of a two part paper which has been prepared by A. Bruce Gaarder, Acting Director, Divisions of Educational Systems Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, U.S.A., for the seminar to be held in the United States from 10th-29th October, 1976. Part II will be distributed in Boston during the first section of the seminar.

2. The document reflects the viewpoints of the author and as such does not necessarily reflect the views of the Organisation or the American authorities.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Dalin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 449

Cultural Pluralism and other Major Issues in American Education

B. Gaarder

Cultural pluralism has not only become an empty concept but a dishonest one as well.

Antonia Pantoja
Barbara Blourock

There could be no more fitting rubric than the new "cultural pluralism" under which to present an overview of the major issues in American education. Most of the dilemmas, contradictions and inconsistencies which beset the nation's schools relate either directly or indirectly to this ambiguous, overworked concept. The subtopics with which the essay is also concerned--equal educational opportunity, compensatory education, desegregation, bilingual/bicultural education, women's educational equity and affirmative action--all define attempts to deal with the overriding issue that lies behind the term cultural pluralism.

Cultural pluralism is viewed by many educators as the antithesis of the old American "melting pot" and by others as a mere euphemism for that pot. The explanation for this confusion of opposites requires us to recall the original melting pot concept (popularized in the early 1900's in Zangwell's play of the same name). The naive view was a "democracy of nationalities" (as Horace Kallen envisioned it in 1915) where each would yield equally to the others and all together would develop a new and nobler way of being human, combining somehow the best from each of the component parts. Kallen's

This essay is not for publication. No official support or endoresement of it by the U.S. Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

democracy of nationalities would be "cooperating voluntarily and autonomously." The national language would be English, "but each nationality would have for its emotional and voluntary life its own peculiar dialect or speech, its own individual and inevitable esthetic and intellectual forms."* Kallen's vision clearly mistook the reality of the American crucible of races and cultures.

That reality can best be summed up in the unabashed--and quite correct--statement in 1909 by the widely influential American educator, Elwood P. Cubberly, regarding the function of the nation's schools:

> "Our task is to assimilate or amalgamate these people as a part of the American race, and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law, order, and popular government..."**

"The task", Dr. Vecoli said, "was not to Americanize but to Anglo-Saxonize" the immigrants. As we shall see later, because of the overriding factor of power--political, economic, and linguistic--the result could scarcely have been otherwise.

---

* Horace M. Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States (New York: Moni and Liverright, 1929)

**Rudolph J. Vecoli. The statement is quoted from a paper by Dr. Vecoli, Professor of History, University of Maine, published in the Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education...on H.R. 14910 (The Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers bill), Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1970, p. 71.

That result, in briefest review, is generally well known. In large measure, the immigrant peoples yielded. Joshua Fishman, a strong proponent of cultural and linguistic diversity and in no way naive, has noted the factors that seem to have controlled the process:

> "...the irresistible attractiveness of American mass-culture; the destruction of immigrant folkways under the impact of rapid American industrialization and urbanization; the openness and ampleness of the American reward system through public education to social mobility...the emphases on childhood and youth, and the outdating of adult values and patterns;...an 'Old World weariness'..."

All of this plus the fact that

> "The English language--as a symbol, as a cause, as a supreme good--does not figure prominently in the scheme of values, loyalties, and traditions by which Americans define themselves as 'American.'" "Only rarely has America taken steps to hasten the linguistic and cultural enfeeblement of its immigrant groups. ...Immigrant minorities were never forbidden to organize and maintain their own communities, organizations, schools, or publications."*

Despite concerted, long-term, costly, often heroic efforts by most of the immigrant groups to maintain them, the languages have disappeared--or all but disappeared--and the separate cultures were slowly pared ever closer to the last redoubt of annual folk days, culinary specialties, museum vestiges and nostalgia.

The case of the non-immigrant ethnic groups was vastly different for two powerful reasons. First, whereas the others came by their own

*Joshua A. Fishman et al. Language Loyalty in the United States. (The Hague: Mouton, 1966 pp. 29-30)

free will, the blacks were brought forcibly as slaves, the native American Indians were overrun and dispossessed, the Mexican Americans became citizens by force of conquest, and the Puerto Ricans have the enfeebling status of colonialism. Second, all these peoples live under the scourge of racial discrimination by a society which looks askance at its "visible minorities."

In between the immigrants and others as described here are the Asiatics, the one immigrant group which is also a visible minority and for that reason subjected to racial discrimination and the resulting second class status as citizens.

Put most simply, the immigrant peoples (except the Asiatics), with whatever degree of misgivings, have been for the most part acculturated and assimilated. The lingering consciousness of their loss is still there. The sense of having been--of still being--separate peoples may never disappear. There is community solidarity, the communality of religion, and the persisting strong tendency to vote as ethnic blocs. Michael Novak has called them "unmeltable," but they have been in the crucible and now there is nothing to go back to. Above all, the languages are gone. As for the others, the visible minorities (20 million blacks, at least 15 million hispanos if one includes the Cubans and other Latin Americans, Chinese, Japanese and other Asiatics, and some Indians), the majority people has wanted them to want to assimilate, but in the end has always closed the door to any meaningful integration. They have not been allowed a

place at the table. They have been excluded. Cultural pluralism is a philosophy and a strategy devised by the excluded, visible ethnic minorities for gaining admission to the feast. They alone have been kept out. They want in. The visible minorities in the United States have for years been engaged in an increasingly successful struggle for social justice, fair treatment and respect: the right to participate freely and equitably in everything along with all other Americans. Their promotion of cultural pluralism is one aspect of that struggle.

So we see that cultural pluralism is not at all the opposite of the melting pot. In no sense is it a kind of withdrawal or separatism. It is as strongly integrative as Theodore Roosevelt and Elwood Cubberly could have wished, but with one small illusory difference: the pluralists hope that somehow it will be possible to integrate, i.e., participate, in every way at every level and at the same time maintain and develop still more their non-English languages and their distinctive cultural traits. The remainder of this section of the essay deals with that illusory difference.

Probably the best treatment of cultural pluralism is the book Badges and Indicia of Slavery: Cultural Pluralism Redefined, edited by

Antonia Pantoja and Barbara Blourock (authors of our epigraph) and James Bowman.* Its extraordinarily cogent definition of cultural pluralism (pp. vi-xi) provides the basis of the following comments. In that extended definition and analysis they envisage a society in which "individuals and groups can function successfully in one, two, or more languages and cultural styles..." In that society the dominant group will "learn to deal with their prejudices." "Cultural pluralism can be made a reality if the school system is used as a positive tool to teach it..." There must be a realization that "all cultures have a right to institutions which reflect their values, language, authority system and way of life..." Finally, "it is the right of every child to acquire basic educational skills in his own language."

What makes this vision illusory is that its proponents overlook the human propensity to strive for power and wealth (and the fact that power cannot be given, must be taken), and they show no awareness of the social and political dynamics of bilingualism.

Exceptional individuals may decide what language they will speak: peoples have no choice. (This subject will be treated in further detail in the section on bilingual schooling.) For our purpose here the point is that elitist or academic bilingualism (as when an American learns and speaks Russian or German) is voluntary, but when

*(Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, 1975.)

Puerto Ricans or Navajos or Quebekers learn English it is not voluntary. They have no choice. They are being assimilated by and to a dominant people in their nation. Only the dominated people becomes bilingual in this sense, and their collective bilingualism is a notably unstable linguistic phenomenon. Since it is essentially a means of mediating between two monolingual peoples, it serves no such further purpose as soon as most of the dominated people have learned the other group's language. At that point "language shift" can be expected to occur, and the weaker language is normally abandoned. The history of these matters reveals two kinds of exceptions to this general principle.

There are at least two ways to protect the weaker language in a situation involving collective, two-people bilingualism of the kind with which we are dealing. One relies heavily upon--even takes advantage of--the negative forces of discrimination, illiteracy and poverty, which combine to keep the weaker people isolated from contact with the dominant people. It is these forces which have protected the Navajo and other Indian languages thus far, and which, combined with constant immigration from and proximity to Mexico, have maintained Spanish for the Chicanos. In the case of the Puerto Ricans, there is still the protection afforded by their tiny hinterland of Spanish language institutions and culture, but the economic, linguistic and other cultural pressures from the English-dominated continent increase constantly the incidence of assimilative

bilingualism. The Asiatics, particularly the Chinese, have sought protection and strength in the semi-isolation of urban enclaves, plus recourse to extensive, systematic, non-English language-based activities designed to maintain their cultural integrity. The irony is that these minorities' successful fight for social justice is eliminating those same negative forces and exposing Spanish and the scores of Indian languages and the Asian tongues ever more dangerously to language shift. There is no evidence that the cultural pluralists have taken this into account.

The other way to protect a language from the eventual shift resulting when collective bilingualism finally runs its course combines stringent laws to guarantee cultural autonomy, and an endless effort to increase and assure the prestige of the endangered language and the quality and kind of decisions made in it. There is virtually no evidence that any of the non-English mother tongue groups in the United States are aware of this alternative or would consider working toward it. This point will be referred to again in the section on bilingual education.

There need be no doubt that the strongly assimilative force and sweep of the American experience has caused incalcuable loss to both the immigrants and to the others. This essay is not the place to assess what the former groups have gained in return, and it is not meant to suggest that their gamble was not a winning one. As for the "others," they are speaking for themselves. What we cannot leave

unsaid here is that the experience of growing up under the pressures of such assimilation does violence to children and virtually guarantees inequality of educational opportunity. The reasoning is simple: Schooling in any case is designed to make the children of the lower classes more like those of the upper classes (or failing that, to make them recognize their inferiority: "We did our part. You didn't pass."). This truism can be tested most easily by a consideration of language and its teaching. Upper class children, on the whole, are likely to be (or become) natural speakers of the kind and quality of English that the schools seek to inculcate, and for that reason they have a great advantage over the others. What is true of language is no less true of the complex of subleties called culture. It is the lower class child and particularly the lower class child of another culture who must change, sometimes to a drastic extent, in order to conform to the preferred model. *

* A typical example of incongruity is found in the book cited above where Larry Freeman and Paul Olson describe the disparity between the tests of musical ability and achievement used nation-wide in the assessment of educational progress (NAEP) and the reality of "the people's music." On the one hand music of school music professionals "derived almost exclusively from Western European 'high culture'...and Western European conceptions of pitch, tonality, harmony, and performance-timing; on the other hand "the diversity in the American musical heritage--ranging from black worksongs and spiritual songs to pietistic and evangelical hymnody...to Appalachian folksongs; from music associated with labor movements to that in which Calvinistic tendencies severely limit the repertoire, to Native American songs employed on occasions of love, death, honoring, religious ceremony, etc. One may also contrast the examination's view of music with the living ways in which music represents, indoctrinates, and explores cultural ideologies." (pp. xx-xxi)

(Continued on following page)

The educational programs, "innovations," designed to achieve cultural pluralism are many and of many kinds: ethnic studies programs revisions of the curriculum; alternative ethnic schools, "colleges" and "universities;" bilingual-bicultural education in the schools and the training of teachers for such schools; and most ironically of all, as we shall see, a host of "multicultural" programs, centers, departments, and curricula. The second part of the essay will deal with these--their problems, financing, and evaluation--in more detail.

(Footnote continued from previous page)

One is reminded of the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., the maximum religious edifice in the nation, about a century in building and now nearing completion. A glorious structure of prodigious effects in stone, glass, and rare woods, an incredible cultural anachronism modeled from 14th century England.

Section Two - Equal Educational Opportunity

The efforts of parents and educators to assure equal educational opportunity for all children (which really means a more nearly equal chance at a good education for the lowest socio-economic classes, particularly the children of the groups called excluded in the preceding section) is clouded no less than cultural pluralism with contradiction and inconsistency.*

The preceding section addresses educational and social inequity from the point of view of the ethnic minorities with distinct cultures and in some cases different languages. The present section begins to deal with the issue of inequity arising from differences of socioeconomic class. Here it should be noted that at the upper levels the advantages of class often transcend ethnicity, but at the lower levels the child is in double jeopardy: he bears the weight of his cultural differences plus that of his differences of class.

What was said above as a truism about the educational effect of the assimilation process is equally true of the social classes. The children now called "disadvantaged" must somehow learn how to act,

*It is neither irrelevant nor inconsequential that we Americans' 200-year love affair with human equality has never been disturbed by our knowing at the same time that in all of nature there is in fact no equality--nothing is equal (identical, the same) to anything else.

talk, and think like their "betters." (It would be more accurate to say "act, talk, and think as upper-class children will eventually act, talk and think," for it is not disputed that in these matters the school's influence is generally outweighed by the sum of all influences outside of the school.) It is a form of intra-group assimilation. The fact that the matter is never presented in these disturbing terms does not mean that the idea has not occurred to our social planners. Nevertheless, the language of their planning seems to rest on other, more optimistic, assumptions.

There is much reason to assert that Americans until very recently have regarded education unquestioningly as the great equalizer, the power plant of "Americanization" and upward mobility. Schoolmen have happily encouraged this belief. However, there is also enough disqualifying evidence to warrant a glance at the matter here. A certain disillusionment about the immediate payoff of college study in terms of prestigious, well-paid employment has appeared during the recent economic recession as college bachelors, masters, and doctors have found themselves pushed into the real work force. This is not a part of the disqualifying evidence. Rather, we refer to indications of widespread disparity between the formal requirements for many kinds of employment and the lesser qualifications actually needed to perform the work.

Ivar Berg has presented the evidence and we depend here on his work.* Most briefly summarized, employers equate educational achievement not so much with the job to be performed, as with "commitment to good middle-class values, industriousness, seriousness of purpose, as well as salutary personal habits and styles." "Evidence of self-discipline and potential for promotion" (p.12). "An ability to get along with others and make the most of opportunities" (p.15). Interviews (reported by Berg) with executives of companies make it plain that "the content of a college program mattered a good deal less than the fact of successful completion of studies" (p.75).

A few cases in point: Data collected in 1967 on the productivity, turnover, and absenteeism of 585 female blue-collar workers in a Mississippi textile plant showed that educational achievement was inversely related to performance thus conceived (p.87). A study of 762 blue-collar workers in a Southern hosiery plant produced similar results: no association of productivity and turnover with educational achievement among day-shift workers and an inverse relationship for night-shift workers (p. 88). A study of "gray-collar" workers in a paper company showed that short-tenure employees had a median of four and one-half semesters of college, and a matched sample of employees of longer service had only slightly more than three. The longer-tenure (and more valuable) employees scored substantially lower

*Ivar Berg. Education and Jobs - The Great Training Robbery (New York: Praeger, 1970) passim

on an intelligence test (p. 91).

The sales of 4000 employees of an insurance company were entirely anomalous with respect to the educational achievements as between high school graduates and college graduates (p. 93). A study (of turnover data and number of lost accounts per teller) in 125 branch offices of a major New York bank of 500 workers showed performance to be inversely associated with educational achievement (p. 93).

Berg gives particular attention to reviewing personnel studies conducted by the nation's armed forces (navy, army, and air force) (pp. 18, 153, 155, 159) and sums it up thus: "The military experience, which has been far more thoroughly documented than that of the so-called private sector, is substantially subversive of the prevailing ideologies that make so much of marginal increments of formal education."

Finally, we come to school and college teachers. We know that the majority of positions which now require college degrees are in "education" itself and that the educational achievement of teachers (in these terms) has increased dramatically in the past two decades. We know too that teachers are paid and promoted not on the basis of performance but on educational increments and tenure. It is not amiss, therefore, for Berg to remind us (p. 180) that 'there is no evidence that relates [pupils'] performance to their teachers' educational achievements." This is no surprise when we recall that

educational research has thus far failed to identify any methodologies, techniques, procedures, attitudes, etc., which consistently and unambiguously relate positively to pupil achievement.

Berg's studies are supported powerfully by the conclusions of Christopher Jencks and his colleagues in the well-known Inequality: A Reassessment of Family and Schooling in America. The Jencks group says this on the subject of the re-distribution or more equitable distribution of income (and that, rather than the equitable distribution of knowledge is what "equal educational opportunity" is all about):

> Variation in men's incomes proved even harder to explain than variation in their occupational statuses. Educational credentials influence the occupations men enter, but credentials do not have much effect on earnings within any given occupation, so their overall effect on income is moderate. Family background and cognitive skills have some effect on a man's occupation, and some effect on his income even after he has entered a given occupation, but their overall influence is also moderate. The genes that influence IQ scores appear to have relatively little influence on income. As a result, we estimate that there is nearly as much income variation among men who come from similar families, have similar credentials, and have similar test scores, as among men in general. This suggests either that competence does not depend primarily on family background, schooling, and test scores, or else that income does not depend on competence.
>
> *****
>
> None of the evidence we have reviewed suggests that school reform can be expected to bring about significant social changes outside the schools. More specifically, the evidence suggests that equalizing educational opportunity would do very little to make adults more equal. (pp. 254-255).

Irving Kristol, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and co-editor of the quarterly The Public Interest, has said this

on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal, August 12, 1976:

> "The social order we call 'capitalism,' constructed on the basis of a market economy, does not believe that 'society' ought to prescribe a 'fair' distribution of income. ...the kind of liberal society historically associated with capitalism was, from its very beginnings, hostile to any political or 'social' definition of distributive justice."

The object of these seeming digressions is to make a double point: "education" is not as important a factor in the (equitable) distribution of income as it is popularly believed to be, and even if it were, there are in-built 'inequities' which are so much a part of the American educational (and economic) systems that no amount of tinkering with the schools can do more than remove their roughest, most galling edges. Which is not to suggest that that alone would not be worth doing.

Similarly, there is enough evidence to warrant the suspicion of widespread inflation of the educational requirements for professional degrees and licenses. (There will be further attention to this point in Section Six, below: Affirmative Action.)

The inflation of educational and licensing requirements becomes doubly significant in the context of this essay when one examines the proposition that education in the United States, particularly above the junior high school level, may have become preponderantly a custodial function. Schooling seems to have three main purposes: instruction, classifying and sorting people, and the custody of children and youth. All would probably agree that the first of these purposes should loom

largest, the second should be achieved fairly, and the third should be only incidental. What seems to obtain, however, is that the custodial function is now preponderant, the classifying and sorting practices are widely perceived as unfair, and instruction is in third place.

The overall explanation for the new preponderance is that for reasons stemming from the nation's economy (reasons at which I cannot even guess) our society provides for its youth less and less significant participation in the significant affairs of its adults. Youths 12 to 22 years of age must be somewhere, and since the choice is perceived as school or the streets, our society chooses the school. The resulting general malaise within those school and college buildings is unquestionably a major (though unacknowledged) issue in American education. The evidence in support of this proposition is indirect and circumstantial, but it is not inconsiderable.

+ The inordinate increase in school and college attendance.
+ The notable decrease in the effectiveness of schooling at all levels in the teaching (learning?) of reading and writing, i.e., the common language.
+ The popular perception (in greater degree than ever before noted) of higher education as being questionable utility.
+ Court decrees which greatly limit the teacher's recourse to suspension or punishment of unmanageable students. (Obscene and insulting language directed to the teacher is not sufficient grounds.)

+ The replacement of annual promotion (and retention and demotion) of students on the basis of demonstrated academic merit, by "social promotion" irrespective of what is learned.*

+ Greatly increased vandalism to school buildings, and increased incidence of assaults by students against teachers ($500 million to vandalism; 70,000 assaults against teachers; 100 homicides in a single year).

+ Increasingly adverse criticism of the preparation of teachers and of the institutions which prepare them.

+ Successful pressure by students to eliminate requirements for graduation from high school and college and for entrance to college.

+ Unemployment of youth (apart from those enrolled in school and college) of about 8% for whites and 40% and above for blacks and other visible minorities.

+ The inflation of requirements, noted above, for licensing and employment which tends to increase school and college attendance. (If there were a surplus of jobs, requirements for obtaining them and school and college attendance would decrease.)

+ The realization (generally unvoiced) that the public (parents) have no recourse irrespective of what goes on in the schools "what with both parents working and the apartment being on the thirteenth floor and no play space."

+ Efforts by harried teachers to convert their methodologies and attitudes to "student-centered" and "student-directed" ones (for a number of reasons, including the realization of whose is really the dominant voice in the enterprise).

---

*This sore issue recently came to a Kafkaesque head when the San Francisco school board found itself sued by a high school graduate whose plaint was that the schools were negligent for not having at least taught him to read (Doe v. San Francisco Unified School District, 1974). The court found the defendant district immune from tort liability for negligent conduct of employees with respect to 'academic' subjects. An interest in learning to read is apparently not cognizable under tort law. The case makes fascinating reading!

+ the great increase in social services within the schools: breakfast, lunch, medical and dental services, psychiatric social workers, community liaison personnel, etc.

+ Increased demand for and establishment of pre-schools and day-care centers, for reasons which include the mother's need to work outside of the home.

The glancing reference made above to America's love affair with the notion of human equality calls for at least passing mention of a kind of perversion that besets education in this country. The problem is to reconcile every child's, every youth's right to the education needed to develop and realize his full potential with the obvious truth that the range and variety of human potential are immensely wide. The dilemma becomes evident when we note that on the one hand the schools unfairly categorize and stratify children (put most crudely, the I.Q. is a measure of how much you are like me) and tend to maintain the status quo, while on the other hand our schools at the senior high level and our colleges are crowded with youths who do not want to be there and cannot profit sufficiently from the experience which the schools are traditionally organized to provide. The situation is then worsened by perversion of the principle of equality (equal application of the law, the Bill of Rights, etc.) into a "right to be equal" which then becomes an "obligation to be equal," and a kind of embarrassment among educators and reluctance to recognize publicly the manifest differences among children.

The need to deal with those differences beginning at the junior high school level and deal with them more wisely, more fairly and

without embarrassment seems evident, but the educator, at best, thinks the school is probably a child-stifler, plays it safe and passes him on to the next higher level. It is anathema to suggest that schooling, after the elementary level, cannot but be essentially elitist: a selecting and differentiating process by which special skills and excellence of every kind are created, encouraged, and pushed to their highest limits. Higher schooling is elitist because each student must be helped to become as different from the common run as his potential will permit--a flutist, a football quarterback, a quadratic equator, etc. The curse against academic elitism is in no way lessened by pointing out that the way athletics function is the quintessence of elitism.

Section Three - Compensatory Education

Who should be blamed for the shortcomings found in American schools and colleges vis-a-vis the children of the poor? The teachers, the institutions as such, the students, or their parents? That was the question back in the early 1960's when public anxiety had mounted to the point that "something had to be done."

School people, boards of education and schools of education leaned quickly toward one view of the matter. They saw "middle-class culture" of the larger society and they also saw many sub-cultures which "vary in the extent to which their socializing influences (i.e., intra-family relationships, child-rearing practices, language patterns, intellectual pursuits, behavioral norms, values, outlooks, etc.) equip children to adapt successfully to the prevailing middle-class cultural patterns."* Since middle-class values and behaviors and experiences are required for successful participation in the schools, the sub-cultures' "disadvantaged" children obviously needed help, compensatory help.

The excluded minorities saw it all differently. In their judgment, the system, the school and the teachers were at fault and should be changed. Many saw the middle class and its children as the truly

*Here and elsewhere in this essay the writer has reason to acknowledge the excellence in these matters of the IRCD Bulletin, published bi-monthly for the Information Retrieval Center for the Disadvantaged, first by Yeshiva University and presently by Teacher's College, Columbia University, and Educational Testing Services. The quotation is from Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1965.

"disadvantaged" ones because of the narrowness and narcissism of their ethnocentricity and class bias. These critics believed and continue to believe that their only real problem is that of being poor and powerless.

The Congress, understandably, found it more reasonable to make its show of concern by legislation designed to help the poor "measure up" rather than legislation which would lay the blame on a more powerful constituency. Compensatory education, therefore, would be based on the assumption that the problem lay with the inadequacies of the learners, their parents and the culture of poverty, and would seek to compensate for those inadequacies by providing extra services and instruction. In other words, the schools were to be given special, additional funds each year to do what school people might think was best for those children whom they chose to call disadvantaged.

The result, to cite the earliest and major example, was the billion-dollar Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

> TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES
>
> DECLARATION OF POLICY
>
> SEC. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Needless to say, the dozen and more years of experience since compensatory education became widespread have not settled the matter of blame.

The question at the beginning was: How should the compensatory funds best be spent? Today that question is no less worrisome. School people find it easy to believe that "good schools make good students," and much of the money went that way. However, the way compensatory education was conceived it also supported the proposition that "good students make good schools," (a notion that can be clarified by imagining for a moment that famed Phillips Exeter Academy has been moved to Harlem, every brick and book, complete with faculty, board of governors and its endowment, but without its students. It would become a "problem school" within weeks.) It should be recalled too that Coleman, in his famed study, reported that what children come to school with accounts for more of the variation in their achievement than any other factor.

To the extent that the Phillips Exeter example is valid, two other propositions follow: even the very best school (by middle-class standards) might not be good for "disadvantaged" children; and the expenditure of compensatory funds to achieve that kind of excellence might be a waste of money (although, citing Coleman again, for disadvantaged children, there was some evidence that better facilities might help, e.g., a chemistry lab if chemistry is to be studied and the school had no such laboratory).

Compensatory education on the scale of Title I, ESEA, began at the elementary school level, with emphasis on preschool efforts, but since 1965 the principle underlying it has been extended and applied at other levels and in other ways. If young children are to receive special help, why not teen-agers, college students and adults? Thus the principle, once established, gave legitimacy to "demands for preferential hiring in industry and preferential admission to college and graduate school."

It is worth noting that this kind of compensation is designed to help the individual student. It does little for the ethnic group or community. In fact, the charge has been made, especially regarding the upper age levels, that to the extent that it succeeds, the individual's success may lure him or her up and away from the needy community. This constant drain of leadership would tend to leave the community unprotected and unchanged.. To combat this, blacks and Spanish-speakers arranged through their own organizations to keep their college level youth in close contact with the community and to encourage by every means their service and leadership for those of their people who most needed help. Many Federal assistance programs in the schools now require participation of community advisory boards composed of parents and youth, etc. from the affected group in each project.

(This section on compensatory education lacks the final three or four pages. They will come later.) --B. Gaarder

Section Four - Desegregation

It all began long before 1954 and Brown vs. Board of Education, but that case is the key to much of what we can say here. A second watershed came ten years later in 1964 with passage of the Civil Rights Act. Twenty years after Brown, over 45% of the country's black students were still in schools where enrollment was at least 80% minority students. In the 20 cities containing one-third of the nation's black students, over 81% are still in schools where enrollment is over 80% minority.

In the simplest terms, before 1954 segregation and dual black or white school systems were the rule in the South. In the North, supposedly less marred by racial prejudice, there was some integration and much segregation. Supposedly it was defacto: it occurred through chance patterns of housing. In the South it was de jure, i.e., the clearly intentional result of public policy. In Brown the Supreme Court found dual or segregated schools to be inherently unequal and illegal and ordered their elimination with all deliberate speed.

There followed ten years of deliberately lethargic sparring. "The Supreme Court itself probably unwittingly encouraged ragged and sporadic compliance with its decision in the Brown case by adopting the 'all deliberate speed' formula... For more than a decade the Federal courts were concerned with the massive resistance schemes whereby southern school systems (or, more accurately, legislators) sought, in many cases quite clumsily, to adopt ingenious

or ingenuous pupil placement plans, 'freedom of choice' proposals, selective school closings, grade by grade desegregation, and other often transparent schemes to avoid the inevitable. The delays inherent in litigating these schemes plus the obvious reluctance of many lower Federal court judges to fully implement desegregation added to a natural disinclination among school administrators to really do very much about the problem. Somehow, everyone seemed to believe, it would all vanish, the nightmare would soon end, the 'inevitable' wasn't all that inevitable." (Silver) That era of sparring ended with passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could now impose the sanction of withholding Federal funds from school districts that were not desegregating. Whatever the reluctance of the Department at times to act, the effect was powerful: "It accorded formal recognition to the Brown decision and supported the often lonely and halting efforts of the Federal judiciary to come to grips with the problems of school desegregation." (Silver)

Most of the early litigation took place in the South. Meanwhile, it had become apparent that whether a given situation in the North should be adjudged de facto or de jure, northerners would resist no less (and perhaps more bitterly) the courts' rulings. The rhetoric inclined to focus on "busing" and defense of the "neighborhood school," but the real reasons were, on the one hand racial prejudice and fear of violence, and the belief that the

quality of the child's education would decrease; on the other hand the new racial pride and fear of violence and resentment that "anyone would think our children can't learn unless they're seated next to a white child."

Apart from the political problems, two severe dilemmas have arisen which relate to the quality of education. It has been apparent from the beginning that enforced integration did not necessarily lessen the quality of the white child's schooling nor did it necessarily improve things for the black or brown child. Following her extensive review of the literature (largely inconclusive) Dr. Nancy H. St. John, lecturer and research associate at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, made this carefully balanced statement in 1968: "...the most plausible hypothesis is that the relation between integration and achievement is a conditional one: the academic performance of minority group children will be higher in good integrated than in good segregated schools, providing they are supported by staff and accepted by peers.* Since those conditions may not be met, it follows that integration has often resulted in less effective schooling. The hard fact underlying the dilemma is that "the first right, the great right in the light of Brown vs. Board of Education is that of a desegregated education--and all else, including 'educational excellence' is subordinate." (Silver)

* Nancy H. St. John. "Minority Group Performance Under Various Conditions of School Ethnic and Economic Integration" (Printed in part in the IRCD Bulletin, Vol. IV, No. 3, Mary 1968, New York: Yeshiva University).

The second dilemma has come about slowly, in the minds of the minority groups. Although some of their strongest organizations (e.g., the venerable and prestigious NAACP--National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) are adamantly in favor of integration as the first goal, there is that growing resentment mentioned above, the growing refusal to accept that in order to learn satisfactorily, the minority child--black or brown--must be in a classroom with whites. This very reasonable sentiment reflects still another facet of the race and schooling controversies, one already mentioned above in the section on compensatory education: although the visible minorities do not ever under-estimate the effects of racial discrimination (caste, quasi-caste) they are certain that it is the condition of poverty and powerlessness that prevents most of them from getting a good education.

Two cases can be cited to illustrate this. One is Dunbar, the famous, elitist, all-black high school that flourished in Washington, D.C. long before the Brown issue was raised. From Dunbar came a long line of now distinguished blacks: Charles Drew, Ralph Bunche, Stanton L. Wormley, Edward Brooke, etc.

The nostalgia still felt for that great school--long replaced--overlooks the extent to which Dunbar reflected a bitter class struggle within the black community itself, with all of the overtones of superiority--inferiority (and no small measure of color-consciousness)that still prevail today. If today's well-to-do,

highly educated blacks wished to do so they could found new all-black Dunbars and the children there would doubtless learn as well as those in any exclusive upper-class all-white suburb. They have not yet chosento do so.

The second case is that of Atlanta, Georgia, a kind of queen city of the South where there has long been a comparatively large, stable sub-culture of well-to-do, even wealthy, highly educated blacks. When the threat of Brown or Swann-type litigation (which could have forced the desegregation of Atlanta's inner-city black schools, integration with the ring of white suburbs, increased "white flight" and massive disruptive busing) the black community, doubtless bearing in mind the dilemmas noted above, made a compromise deal with the whites. Instead of that litigation and all that might ensue, the blacks opted for more power. Specifically, control of the school board. There is also now a black superintendent of schools in Atlanta and a black mayor.

The quality of education, says the Supreme Court, must be reconciled with a unitary school system, and not vice-versa. Even so, "certain actions are not necessarily constitutionally required. Thus, each and every school in a system need not be desegregated; no fixed percentage of black to white students equal to their general proportion in the school population is necessary (although if a school board chose such a system, it could clearly do so), and busing 'harmful to the child' or 'significantly impinging' upon the

educational process will be discountenanced. (Silver)*

"Desegregation" is now the rule and reality, but "integration" is still far in the future. Furthermore, in addition to the problems accompanying inter-school shifts (usually by busing) there is now an increasing problem of intra-school (within the school building) segregation or re-segregation to thwart the law. Intra-school segregationists are accused of using many strategies, but principally suspension of students from school, "tracking," i.e., devising separate curriculums for most blacks and most whites, and exclusion of minority children from full participation in extra-curricular activities.**

*The references and quoted statements dealing with the courts in this section are from a paper, "How to Understand Supreme Court Decisions," by Isidore Silver. I do not know whether it has been published.

**The description of these strategies relies heavily on newspaper reports and on an article "Public Schools and the New Segregation Struggle," by Nicolaus Mills (editor of the Great School Bus Controversy, Teachers College Press, 1973) in Equal Opportunity Review, Teacher's College, Columbia University, August 1975.

The Children's Defense Fund cites these figures as evidence of the new discrimination:*

City	Minority Enrollment	Minority Suspensions
New York	64.4%	85.9%
Houston	56.4%	71.0%
Cleveland	59.9%	70.8%
Memphis	58.0%	70.2%
Dallas	49.4%	68.5%

There have been separate Supreme Court rulings (Goss v. Lopez in Columbus, Ohio, and Hobson v. _____ in Washington, D.C.) against suspension without due process and against tracking, but the practices persist. Apparently there are ways to assure white domination of the school yearbook, the band, the cheering squads, the student government, the honors society. Only in athletics, football and basketball, does the urge to exclude yield to the passion for winning.

There must be at least passing mention of the particularly heavy burden laid on the Puerto Rican in continental United States. The Puerto Ricans are an ethnically mixed people, combining elements of the aboriginal boricuas with the dominant infusion of European, principally Spanish, stock, plus an admixture from immigrant African peoples. On their own nation-island they have achieved

*Children's Defense Fund, in "Children Out of School in America" (October 1974, p. 130).

such racial harmony that there may well be children of several hues within a single loving family. The term negra is most likely to be used as a mark of endearment. In the United States they are under both the curse of being of a different culture and language and the curse of not all being white. The point in the context of this summary is that successful litigation to desegregate a school and the consequent shifting (busing) of "whites" here and "blacks" there results in dividing Puerto Rican families, brother from brother, along color lines.

In terms of specific programs and intervention by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the principal activities bearing upon desegregation flow from the Civil Rights Act. These will be the subject of closer analysis in Part Two of the paper.

Section Five - Bilingual-Bicultural Education

Bilingual education, the most innovative, most generous educational intervention of modern times, is controversial and confusing because it is essentially a sociological reform rather than a pedagogical one. Despite claims that it is merely a "new medicine for the poor" (because of the poverty criterion for participation in funding under the original Bilingual Education Act), the Congress was saying for the first time--to those who wanted to listen--"There's more than one way of being human and still being a first-class citizen, even if you want to go on speaking a language other than English." The main instrument for that Congressional assertion is the Bilingual Education Act passed in 1968, but several other acts support that one with generous funding and authority.

Bilingual education means the use of two languages--two mediums--to teach and learn all or any significant part of the regular school curriculum (except that ordinary foreign language instruction alone is not considered to be bilingual education). Since the entire program of American schools is already presented exclusively through the medium of English, the establishment of bilingual education means essentially the addition of the other language--the children's non-English mother tongue--as a medium of instruction. It should also mean special attention to the techniques of teaching English as the children's second language. (Second chronologically, not second in importance.)

Bilingual education loses much of its effectiveness unless it is also bicultural: unless it includes the history and culture of the linguistic minority, and unless the efforts inside the school are reinforced by corresponding prestigious uses of the language by adults.

The introduction of bilingual schooling is a sociological reform but of course it is powerful pedagogy too, for it is axiomatic world-wide that the best language for any child to learn in is the mother tongue (besides the fact that Spanish and Navajo, for examples, are better, easier school languages for little children who speak them natively, simply because--unlike English, the "fit" between the way they sound and the way they are written and spelled is almost perfect.

Despite the presence of millions of persons in the United States who speak a language other than English, there is a clear shortage of persons qualified to work as teachers, supervisors, counsellors, etc., if a non-English language is to be a principal medium of instruction, for American schools and colleges have offered no such role to anyone in the past and have had no reason to prepare persons for such roles. In fact it has been documented repeatedly that educational policy in the United States has generally deplored and sought to discourage the retention and use in the public schools of any mother tongue other than English. (There have virtually never--except in the notable case of German during World War I--been restrictions on the establishment and operation by non-English language groups of their own schools,

churches, theaters, institutions, radio stations, newspapers, etc., in their own tongues.)

In quantitative terms the need is great for specially trained persons on the non-English side of bilingual schooling. At the most conservative estimate the number of children of school age who could benefit from such schooling is at least three million and the teachers required for that group would be close to 50,000 for the non-English side of the task alone. It is not likely that there are more than 3000 teachers in the program, nation-wide, and except for the very few educated abroad, there is almost no way that any of them could have received adequate special training for the work.

Bilingual-bicultural education is clearly the major example of action leading toward the "cultural pluralism" discussed above in section one of this paper. Its exponents among the non-English mother tongue peoples (at least 35 Indo-European and more than 100 indigenous tongues) are clear and vociferous on that point. Most of them see it as a long-term movement leading to a new day when their way of life and speech will be "recognized", "respected," "strengthened", and "maintained."

The original Federal legislation, the Bilingual Education Act (1968) was carefully ambiguous on this point and the official Federal view has never been proclaimed. Nevertheless, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Terrel H. Bell, when urged by Spanish-speaking Senator

Joseph Montoya of New Mexico to clarify the goals of the movement, wrote in a letter to the Senator on November 15, 1974:

> I maintain that the proper goal of federally-supported Bilingual/Bicultural Education Programs is precisely that stated in the CE (Office of Education) staff paper cited in your letter--namely, "to enable children whose dominant language is other than English to develop competitive proficiency in English so that they can function successfully in the educational and occupational institutions of the larger society....What we know about the educational process tells us that the most effective and the most humane way to achieve this English language competency is through a Bilingual/Bicultural approach."

This is transitional bilingual education, the one-way bridge to English, another kind of compensatory or remedial treatment for the poor. As noted above, the original Act contained a "poverty criterion" which focused "bilingual" services largely on children from very low income families.

Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, was much more blunt about it in an article related to the consent decree won by the plaintiffs in ASPIRA vs. New York City Board of Education, which now mandates substantive instruction in Spanish for children whose English-language deficiencies prevent them from participating in the learning process in the New York City schools. Speaking in the New York Teacher for January 26, 1975, Shanker said, "It should be made clear that this kind of instruction is transitional, and that children should be moved into regular instruction in English on an on-going basis as their English language skills are strengthened." Reiterating the transitional nature of bilingual education, he said that the

bilingual programs should "self-destruct." "That is, the ultimate goal is to integrate non-English speaking children into the regular school program as soon as possible."*

It should be noted, however, that since education and its policies are largely matters of local option in the United States, the choice between quick transition and long-range maintenance as the goal of local bilingual education could be made by each community (through its school board) without regard for outside views. The question is almost moot, however, for other reasons which are seldom mentioned in the forum.

The first of these is the basically transitional nature of the kind of bilingualism that exists in minority peoples of the United States. It is collective bilingualism, the kind that occurs involuntarily when two peoples--one dominant, the other dominated--are found in a single nation. Bilingualism begins (almost exclusively in the dominated group) and slowly increases as a way of communicating between two monolingual peoples. It is a major form of assimilation. Most commonly, as soon as all or most of the dominated (bilingual) group acquires the other language, the weaker language is abandoned. Two key factors can affect this process: 1) it will be hastened

*Mr. Shanker's opposition is typical of the opposition of organized teacher groups, which oppose the introduction of programs calling for a kind of teaching that their members are unable to provide.

if the children of the bilingual group acquire the new language early, from their parents and at play; 2) it will be slowed if the minority group is sufficiently isolated from the dominant people by such factors as discrimination, residential enclaves, poverty and illiteracy. Both of the factors have long been operative for the visible linguistic minorities in the United States, but thanks to these minorities' increasingly successful struggle for social justice the second factor, the factor which slows the assimilative process, is rapidly losing its force.

The second factor which tends to make the goals of bilingual education moot--at least for the largest group, the Spanish speakers, and for the American Indians--is the extreme shortage of teachers qualified to work in the non-English mediums. Three examples will make the point clear. The State of New Mexico recently gave a formal test to 136 Spanish-speaking teachers who are responsible for instruction through Spanish in its bilingual schools. The test consisted of simple reading and writing exercises based on elementary school Spanish language reading texts from other countries. No one of those tested could function above the third grade level, and only thirteen could function that high. In 1970 a group of thirty-some Spanish-speaking teachers in bilingual schools revealed that no one of them had ever read a book in Spanish. A mid-western state university offers masters and doctoral graduate studies and degrees in bilingual education, directed for the most part to the needs of the largest group, the Spanish speakers. Most of the candidates

for degrees are expecting to work with Spanish speakers. Although language is not the most important part of bilingual education, near-illiteracy in the teachers leaves them helpless. Yet no one of the courses or other activities in that university's programs is given in Spanish and using materials written in Spanish. When asked about this, the director said that they make a special effort to speak Spanish during the coffee breaks.

A notion of the scope of the bilingual education movement can be had from data on the main Federal program in fiscal year 1975 (ending June 30, 1975): 319 classroom projects; 162,124 children enrolled; 44 languages served (10 Indo-European, 17 Asiatic and Pacific; 17 indigenous American); cost, $52,836,176. In addition, some $29,000,000 for teacHer training, and other amounts--up to a grand total of about $85,000,000--for "resource centers," etc. At least 22 State governments also support this kind of educational experimentation.

Not only is bilingual-bicultural education an effort to provide more nearly equal educational opportunity to non-English mother tongue students, but it also--and of necessity--functions as a kind of employment opportunity and "affirmative action" program for the adults of the same groups who serve as teachers, administrators, course writers, etc. In this sense it could be called an exceptional and laudable case of "new careers off the poor." See section three above.

Special mention must be made of certain court rulings which bear strongly on bilingual education. In Lau v. Nichols (1974) the Supreme COurt, without specifying the action that is to be taken, found that schools must take appropriate action (beyond the regular school offerings) to assure that non-English mother tongue children will be effectively educated. In Serna V. Portales (1973) it was established that in the instant case there had been a denial of equal educational opportunity and the remedy had to be "bilingual education." ASPIRA v. Board of Education (1973) resulted in a consent decree requiring New York City to provide extensive instruction through Spanish in the regular school subjects.

Along with a lack of awareness of the natural instability of collective bilingualism and a concerted preference for ignoring the lack of preparation in teachers and those who teach the teachers, there are other troubling beliefs and assumptions that mark the course of bilingual education. For example, the plaint that "we learn their language; they should learn ours too," which overlooks the social and political dynamics of the matter. The dominated group becomes bilingual not by choice but because the economics of the situation forces them to assimilate in that way. No such pressure operates on the dominant group. Another example: Despite the fact that the law does not prohibit the grouping of children for bona fide reasons based on standard pedagogical practice, there is a great reluctance to separate non-English mother

tongue children for the purpose of instructing them through their mother tongue. Somehow, that smacks of "segregation." Yet there is ten times as much such grouping to provide the same children with"English as a second language," a practice which in contrast seems "only natural and proper."

In Part Two of the essay there will be more data on each of the main programs which support bilingual-bicultural education, and efforts to evaluate this extraordinary kind of teaching.

Section Six - Affirmative Action

Affirmative action began as a means of reducing and correcting racial discrimination in private employment. Since 1941 there had been an Executive Order by the President dealing with fair employment practices, but it was limited to such means as posting obligations of employers and revealing their infractions. The first enforcement provisions came in 1961, when the coverage was extended to Federal government as well as private employment and to discrimination on the basis of sex. By the 1960's it had become apparent that non-discrimination alone was not sufficient to correct the inequities and affirmative action was added, i.e., the requirement of positive steps such as actively recruiting minority employees.

It was President Johnson's Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 in 1965 that set today's patterns, and under those orders the affirmative and corrective actions began to affect educational institutions, particularly colleges and universities. It was at this point that women's groups began playing a leading role in the movement.

Five Federal laws against discrimination have since added enforcement agencies with enabling budgets, sanctions and the basis for a body of legal precedents and litigation:

Equal Pay Act of 1963 (as amended)
Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (women in educ.)
Title VII (Sec. 799A) and Title VIII (Sec. 845) of the Public Service Act (health personnel including medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, etc.)

Enforcement was based at first (as in E.O. 11246) on the government's power to revoke Federal contracts with offending parties, delay the issuance of new contracts, and disqualify the offender from eligibility for future contracts. The prevalence of Federal contracts (or grants) with educational institutions--not to mention defense contracts, constructors of public buildings, ships, and highways, and purveyors of supplies, equipment and services for the ordinary functioning of government, etc.--meant that the coverage of the orders was verybroad. The subsequent laws have greatly extended the coverage and kinds of sanctions.

The chief means by which affirmative action is taken is the "affirmative action plan", in effect a detailed, written, public exposure of every significant detail of the employer's hiring and salary records, including evidence of past discrimination, plus a fixed time-table indicating the corrective action that will be taken. The plan will commonly include comparative data on the existence of persons of each sex and ethnic minority possibly eligible for employment in each job category (local or nation-wide as the case may require) and the number of such persons actually employed in each category by the firm or institution. Thus the plan and the subsequent action can be monitored by both the employees and the enforcing agencies. Thus the extent of "underutilization" of members of the affected groups (blacks, Spanish-surnamed, American Indians, and Asians) is a key criterion in the process.

Judicial interpretation has established that no employer is ever required to hire unqualified persons, but rather to ensure that qualifications and merit are recognized and rewarded without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, or sex. The responsibility of the employer is not the achievement of a specific statistical profile. Rather it is to demonstrate positive commitment to the elimination of discrimination.*

In Section Two above some evidence was presented to suggest that the educational requirements for getting employment are often inflated far beyond the skills and knowledge needed to do the work itself. This suggestion applies particularly in the case of standards for licensing. The prestigious Second Newman task force to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made this statement in its report on national policy and higher education:

> Standards of training and competency in many occupations are essential for consumer protection. All too often, however, such standards become the means of limiting entry to careers.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act has been used to attack this problem and"the range of local governmental licensing practices held invalid by the courts has included examinations for police

*The above account draws heavily on Programs for Educational Equity: Schools and Affirmative Action, a 1975 Office of Education Publication prepared by Shirley McCune and Martha Matthews. DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-03001).

officers, transit workers, firefighters...school teaching and supervisory positions..." In Chance v. Board of Examiners the examinations used by New York City to appoint supervisors resulted in there being about one percent of the school principals who were black or Puerto Rican, although the enrollment of those minorities in the city is over 60 percent. The National Teacher Examination (used nation-wide for screening) has likewise been found discriminatory and non-job-related (Walston v. Nansemond County). Much the same thing, although not to the point of a challenge in the courts, can be said of the certification of school administrators. The most far-reaching case, Griggs v. Duke Power Company, spoke directly to "...the infirmity of using diplomas or degrees as fixed measures of capability."*

The above brief account describes affirmative action as it relates chiefly to employment, including employment in any capacity in schools, colleges and universities. The other part of the story deals with similar approaches to equity in respect to the adminssion of women and the visible minorities to higher education and particularly their admission in those courses and programs from wich they have traditionally been excluded. Here the affirmative action

*The remarks on licensing draw heavily from an important book, Teacher Education in the United States: the Responsibility Gap, by Paul Olson's Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1976.)

focuses on enrollment, but also includes for the minorities advance preparation of the enrollees in order to ensure readiness to meet scholastic requirements and post-enrollment measures such as tutoring and counselling to ensure completion of the long grind. There is always need for financial aid. Finally, there is the need to identify bias in the behavior of teachers and administrators, inequities in the allocation of resources (e.g., to women's athletics as compared to men's athletics), and other inequities related to discipline, pregnancy, honors programs, etc.